

Ratio of Price to Expectation and Complete Bernstein Functions

Yukio Hirashita

Abstract

For a game with positive expectation and some negative profit, a unique price exists, at which the optimal proportion of investment reaches its maximum. For a game with parallel translated profit, the ratio of this price to its expectation tends to converge toward less than or equal to $1/2$ if its expectation converges to 0^+ . In this paper, we will investigate such properties by using the integral representations of a complete Bernstein function and establish several Abelian and Tauberian theorems.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: primary 91B24, 91B28; secondary 40E05.

Keywords and phrases: Proportion of investment, Complete Bernstein function, Tauberian theorem.

1. Introduction

Consider a coin-flipping game such that profit is 9 dollars or -2 dollars if a tossed coin yields heads or tails, respectively. For simplicity, we will omit the currency notation. Let $t \in [0, 1]$ be the proportion of investment. Then, the investor repeatedly invests t of his/her current capital (see [12, 13]). For example, let $c > 0$ be the current capital; when the investor plays the game once, his/her capital will be $9ct/u + c(1-t)$ or $-2ct/u + c(1-t)$ if a tossed coin yields heads or tails, respectively, where $u > 0$ is the price of the game such that $u/(u+2) > t$. Let the initial capital be 1. After N attempts, if the investor has capital c_N , then the growth rate (geometric mean) is given by $c_N^{1/N}$. As the value $G_u(t) := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\text{expectation of } c_N^{1/N} \right) = \sqrt{(9t/u + 1 - t)(-2t/u + 1 - t)}$ is a function with respect to t , it reaches its maximum at $t = t_u = (7/2 - u)u / ((u+2)(9-u))$. It is noteworthy that the value $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\text{variance of } c_N^{1/N} \right)$ is 0.

In general, a game $(a(x), F(x))$ would mean that if the investor invests 1 unit (which price is u dollars), then he/she receives $a(x)$ dollars (including the invested money) in accordance with a distribution function $F(x)$, defined on an interval $I \subseteq (-\infty, \infty)$ such that $\int_I d(F(x)) = 1$. It is assumed that the profit function $a(x)$ is measurable and non-constant (a.e.) with respect to $F(x)$. When no confusion arises, we write dF for $d(F(x))$ and use the following notation:

$$(1.1) \quad E := \int_I a(x) dF, \quad \xi := \operatorname{ess} \inf_{x \in I} a(x), \quad H_\xi := \int_I \frac{1}{a(x) - \xi} dF.$$

In this paper, we always assume that $E > 0$ and $\xi > -\infty$. If $\int_{a(x)=\xi} dF > 0$, we define $H_\xi = \infty$ and $1/H_\xi = 0$. Since $a(x)$ is non-constant, we have $\xi < E$, $H_\xi > 0$, $1/H_\xi < \infty$, and $\xi + 1/H_\xi < E$.

In order to explain the background of this paper, we will define notations such as $w_\beta(z)$ and $G_u(t)$ in this paragraph. However, this paper utilizes neither such notations nor their related properties, except in the first paragraph of Section 2. We denote the integral $\int_I (a(x) - \beta) / (a(x)z - z\beta + \beta) dF$ by $w_\beta(z)$, which is holomorphic with respect to two complex variables (z, β) ($z := t + si$, $\beta := u + hi$, $i := \sqrt{-1}$, $\{t, s, u, h\} \subset \mathbb{R}$) near each point (t_0, u_0) such that $0 < t_0 < u_0/(u_0 - \xi)$ and

$u_0 > \max(0, \xi)$. We denote $\exp(\int_I \log(a(x)t/u - t + 1) dF)$ by $G_u(t)$ and term it as *the limit expectation of growth rate* for each $u > 0$ and $0 \leq t \leq 1$ with $\xi t/u - t + 1 > 0$. We say that t_u is *the optimal proportion of investment* with respect to $u > 0$, if

$$(1.2) \quad \overline{\lim}_{\substack{\rho \rightarrow t_u \\ 0 \leq \rho \leq 1 \\ \xi \rho/u - \rho + 1 > 0}} \int_I \log \frac{a(x)t/u - t + 1}{a(x)\rho/u - \rho + 1} dF \leq 0$$

for each $0 \leq t \leq 1$ with $\xi t/u - t + 1 > 0$. A game $(a(x), F(x))$ is said to be *effective* if $\int_{a(x) > 1} a(x)^\nu dF < \infty$ for some $\nu > 0$. If a game is effective, $G_u(t)$ is continuous (see [9, Theorem 4.1]) and the inequality (1.2) implies that $G_u(t_u) = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1, \xi t/u - t + 1 > 0} G_u(t)$, which suggests that t_u is optimal for maximizing the limit expectation of growth rate.

For a game with *parallel translated profit* $(a(x) - m, F(x))$ ($m < E$), we use underlined notations such as $\underline{a}(x) := a(x) - m$, $\underline{E} := E - m$, $\underline{\xi} := \xi - m$, and $\underline{H}_{\underline{\xi}} := H_{\underline{\xi}}$.

From [9, Lemma 3.16], if $m \in (\xi, E)$, then a unique price $\underline{u}_{\max} \in (0, E - m)$ exists such that $\underline{t}_u$ is strictly increasing in the interval $0 < u < \underline{u}_{\max}$ and strictly decreasing in the interval $\underline{u}_{\max} < u < E - m$. It should be noted that $\underline{u}_{\max}$ is a function with respect to $m \in (\xi, E)$, and it satisfies $\underline{t}_{\underline{u}_{\max}} = \max_{0 < u < E - m} \underline{t}_u$. In a sense, $\underline{u}_{\max}$ is considered to be the price in which the broker's commission income is maximized.

Under mild restrictions, we will show that $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max}/\underline{E} = 1/2$ (see Theorem 3.19). In such a case, it suggests that the so-called half price sale makes a profit. For example, in the case of the abovementioned coin-flipping game, we obtain

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \frac{\underline{u}_{\max}}{\underline{E}} = \lim_{m \rightarrow (7/2)^-} \frac{11\sqrt{(m+2)(9-m)}/2 - (m+2)(9-m)}{(7/2 - m)^2} = \frac{1}{2},$$

where $-2 < m < 7/2$ (see Corollary 3.20).

Defining $\Psi(c) := 1/\int_I (a(x) + c)^{-1} dF - c$ ($c \in (-\xi, \infty)$), we obtain the following:

LEMMA 1.1. $\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(c) = E$.

PROOF. Assume $c > \max(1, -2\xi)$. Then, we have $a(x) + c/2 > 0$ and $0 < \int_I c/(a(x) + c) dF \leq \int_I 2dF = 2$. If $E < \infty$, then, by applying Lebesgue's monotone convergence and dominated convergence theorems to the equation

$$\frac{1}{\int_I \frac{1}{a(x)+c} dF} - c = E + \frac{E^2}{c - E} - \frac{\int_I \frac{a(x)^2}{a(x)+c} dF}{\left(1 - \frac{E}{c}\right) \int_I \frac{c}{a(x)+c} dF} \quad (c \neq E),$$

we obtain the conclusion (even if $E \leq 0$). Assume $E = \infty$. Since $a(x)$ is non-constant with respect to $F(x)$, we observe that

$$\Psi'(c) = \frac{\int_I \frac{1}{(a(x)+c)^2} dF - \left(\int_I \frac{1}{a(x)+c} dF\right)^2}{\left(\int_I \frac{1}{a(x)+c} dF\right)^2} > 0,$$

which implies that $\Psi(c)$ is increasing with respect to c . Putting $\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(c) = M$ (including ∞),

$$a_N(x) := \begin{cases} N, & a(x) > N, \\ a(x), & a(x) \leq N, \end{cases} \quad \text{and } b_{c,N} := \frac{1}{\int_I \frac{1}{a_N(x)+c} dF} - c \quad (N > \max(1, \xi)).$$

Then, the following properties hold:

(1) $a_N(x)$ is nondecreasing with respect to N . (2) $b_{c,N}$ is nondecreasing with respect to N . (3) From the above arguments, we obtain $\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} b_{c,N} = \int_I a_N(x) dF < \infty$, which is nondecreasing with respect to N . (4) By applying Lebesgue's (monotone convergence) theorem, we obtain $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} b_{c,N} = \Psi(c)$, which is increasing with respect to c . (5) Further, from Lebesgue's (monotone convergence) theorem, we obtain $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} b_{c,N}) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_I a_N(x) dF = \int_I a(x) dF = \infty$.

Therefore, if $M < \infty$, then $\Psi(c) \leq M$ and $b_{c,N} \leq M$, which contradicts the fact that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} b_{c,N}) = \infty$. Hence, $M = E = \infty$, that is, $\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(c) = E$. $\square$

2. Parallel translated profit

We consider a game with parallel translated profit $(a(x) - m, F(x))$ to have *sufficiently small positive expectation*, if $\xi + 1/H_\xi < m < E$. In this case, it is easy to observe that $\underline{E} = E - m > 0$, $\underline{\xi} = \xi - m < 0$ and $\underline{\xi} + 1/\underline{H}_\xi = \xi - m + 1/H_\xi < 0$. Therefore, from [9, Lemma 4.27], $\eta_m := \lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \underline{t}_u/u$ exists such that $0 < \eta_m < -1/\underline{\xi} = 1/(m - \xi)$. For each $u \in (0, E - m)$ and $t \in (0, u/(u - \underline{\xi}))$, we have $\underline{w}_u(\underline{t}_u) = 0$ where $\underline{w}_u(t) = \int_I (a(x) - m - u) / ((a(x) - m)t - tu + u) dF$ and $\underline{t}_u \in (0, u/(u - \underline{\xi}))$. It should be noted that $(a(x) - m)\underline{t}_u/u - \underline{t}_u + 1 > 0$ and $(a(x) - m)\eta_m + 1 \geq 1 - (m - \xi)\eta_m > 0$ for each $x \in I$. The equation $\underline{w}_u(\underline{t}_u) = 0$ can be written as $\int_I ((a(x) - m)\underline{t}_u/u - \underline{t}_u + 1)^{-1} dF = 1$. Hence, we have

$$(2.1) \quad \int_I \frac{1}{(a(x) - m)\eta_m + 1} dF = 1,$$

because on the set $\{x \mid a(x) \geq m\}$, $1/((a(x) - m)\underline{t}_u/u - \underline{t}_u + 1)$ is strictly increasing with respect to sufficiently small $u > 0$ (see [9, Lemmas 3.12, 3.15 and 3.16]), and on the set $\{x \mid \xi \leq a(x) < m\}$, $1/((a(x) - m)\underline{t}_u/u - \underline{t}_u + 1)$ converges uniformly to $1/((a(x) - m)\eta_m + 1)$ ($u \rightarrow 0^+$).

Since $\Psi(c)$ ($-\xi < c < \infty$) is strictly increasing from $\xi + 1/H_\xi$ to E (see the proof of Lemma 1.1), the equation $m = \Psi(c)$ has a unique solution $c = c_m$ for each $\xi + 1/H_\xi < m < E$. Since the equation $m = 1/\int_I (a(x) + c_m)^{-1} dF - c_m$ is equivalent to

$$\int_I \frac{1}{(a(x) - m)\frac{1}{m+c_m} + 1} dF = 1,$$

from (2.1), we obtain that $\eta_m = 1/(m + c_m)$.

LEMMA 2.1. c_m is strictly increasing from $-\xi$ to ∞ with respect to $m \in (\xi + 1/H_\xi, E)$.

PROOF. As $\Psi(c)$ is strictly increasing from $\xi + 1/H_\xi$ to E , the relation $m = \Psi(c_m)$ leads to the conclusion. $\square$

LEMMA 2.2. η_m is strictly decreasing from H_ξ to 0 with respect to $m \in (\xi + 1/H_\xi, E)$.

PROOF. Since $\eta_m = 1/(m + c_m)$, Lemma 2.1 leads to the conclusion. $\square$

LEMMA 2.3. $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} m\eta_m = 0$.

PROOF. From $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} c_m = \infty$ and Lebesgue's theorem, we obtain the equality $m\eta_m = m/(m + c_m) = \int_I a(x)/(a(x) + c_m) dF$, which implies the conclusion. $\square$

LEMMA 2.4. $\underline{t}_u = u\eta_{m+u}$ ($0 < u < E - m$).

PROOF. From the property of η_{m+u} , we observe that $\int_I ((a(x) - (m + u))\eta_{m+u} + 1)^{-1} dF = 1$, which can be written as $\int_I ((a(x) - m)(u\eta_{m+u})/u - u\eta_{m+u} + 1)^{-1} dF = 1$. This suggests that $\underline{w}_u(u\eta_{m+u}) = 0$. Therefore, by the uniqueness of $\underline{t}_u$, we arrive at the conclusion. $\square$

LEMMA 2.5. $\underline{u}_{\max}$ can be uniquely determined by the system

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{cases} m + v = \Psi(c), \\ v = (m + c)\Psi'(c), \end{cases}$$

with two unknown variables $v (= \underline{u}_{\max})$ and $c (= c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}})$, for each $m \in (\xi + 1/H_\xi, E)$.

PROOF. From $m = \Psi(c_m)$, we obtain $m + \underline{u}_{\max} = \Psi(c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}})$. Since $\underline{t}_{\underline{u}_{\max}} = \max_{0 < u < E-m} \underline{t}_u$, we find that $\underline{t}'_{\underline{u}_{\max}} = 0$. From $\underline{t}_u = u\eta_{m+u} = u/(m + u + c_{m+u})$, we obtain $\underline{t}'_u = (m + c_{m+u} - uc'_{m+u})/(m + u + c_{m+u})^2$. Thus, $m + c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}} - \underline{u}_{\max}c'_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}} = 0$. Using $\Psi'(c_m)c'_m = 1$, we have $m + c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}} - \underline{u}_{\max}/\Psi'(c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}}) = 0$, which implies (2.2). On the other hand, from

$$\Psi''(c) = \frac{2 \left(\left(\int_I \frac{1}{(a(x)+c)^2} dF \right)^2 - \int_I \frac{1}{a(x)+c} dF \int_I \frac{1}{(a(x)+c)^3} dF \right)}{\left(\int_I \frac{1}{a(x)+c} dF \right)^3} < 0 \quad (c > -\xi),$$

$\Psi(c)$ is a strictly concave function due to Schwarz's inequality. Therefore, a line $y - m = \Psi'(c)(x + m)$ that is tangent to $\Psi(c)$ and passes through the point $(-m, m)$ is uniquely determined. This implies the uniqueness of the solution of (2.2). $\square$

EXAMPLE 2.6. The game $(x, \int_0^x 1/(\pi(t+1)\sqrt{t})dt)$ ($x \in (0, \infty)$) has the following properties: $\xi = 0$, $\xi + 1/H_\xi = 0 < m < E = \infty$, $\Psi(c) = \sqrt{c}$, $\eta_m = 1/(m(m+1))$, $c_m = m^2$, $\underline{t}_u = u/((m+u)(m+u+1))$, and $\underline{u}_{\max} = \sqrt{m(m+1)}$.

EXAMPLE 2.7. The game $(x, \int_0^x 8r\sqrt{rt}/(\pi(t+r)^3)dt)$ ($x \in (0, \infty)$, $r > 0$) has the following properties: $\xi = 0$, $\xi + 1/H_\xi = r/3 < m < E = 3r$, $\Psi(c) = (c-r)^3/(c^2-6cr-3r^2+8r\sqrt{cr}) - c$, $\eta_m = (3r-m)^2/(m+r)^3$, $c_m = r(r-3m)^2/(3r-m)^2$, $\underline{t}_u = u(3r-m-u)^2/(r+m+u)^3$, and $\underline{u}_{\max} = (3r-m)(m+r)/(m+9r)$.

REMARK. Since $\underline{E} = E - m > 0$, the assumption $E > 0$ can be dismissed as long as we consider a game $(a(x) - m, F(x))$ with $\xi + 1/H_\xi < m < E$. It is clear that even if $E \leq 0$, $\xi + 1/H_\xi < E$ holds, provided $\xi = \text{ess inf}_{x \in I} a(x) > -\infty$.

3. Complete Bernstein functions

A C^∞ function $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with a continuous extension to $[0, \infty)$ is called a *Bernstein function* if $f \geq 0$ and $(-1)^k f^{(k)}(x) \leq 0$ for each $k \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ (see [5, Definition 1.2.1]).

A function $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called a *complete Bernstein function* if there exists a Bernstein function ϕ such that $f(x) = x^2 \int_0^\infty e^{-sx} \phi(s) ds$ (see [14, Definition 1.4]).

THEOREM 3.1 [14, Theorem 1.5]. *Each of the following five properties of $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ implies the other four:*

- (1) f is a complete Bernstein function.
- (2) f can be represented as $f(x) = \tau x + b + \int_0^\infty x/(x+t) \sigma(dt)$ with $\tau, b \geq 0$ and a measure σ on $(0, \infty)$.
- (3) f extends analytically on $\mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$ such that $f(\bar{z}) = \overline{f(z)}$ and $\operatorname{Im} z \operatorname{Im} f(z) \geq 0$. (In other words, f preserves the upper and lower half-planes in $\mathbb{C}$).
- (4) f is a Bernstein function with representation $f(x) = \tau x + b + \int_0^\infty (1 - e^{-sx}) \beta(s) ds$, where $\tau, b \geq 0$, $\beta(s) = \int_0^\infty e^{-st} \rho(dt)$, and $\int_0^\infty 1/(t(t+1)) \rho(dt) < \infty$. (In fact, $\rho(dt) = t\sigma(dt)$ of (2).)
- (5) $x/f(x)$ is a complete Bernstein function or $f \equiv 0$.

Note that the triple (τ, b, ρ) given above is uniquely determined by f (see [5, Theorem 1.2.3]).

LEMMA 3.2. *The function $\Psi(c) = 1/\int_I (a(x) + c)^{-1} dF - c : (-\xi, \infty) \rightarrow (\xi + 1/H_\xi, E)$ extends analytically on $\mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, -\xi]$ and preserves the upper and lower half-planes.*

PROOF. From Lemma 1.1, we obtain $\Psi((-\xi, \infty)) \subset (\xi + 1/H_\xi, E)$. Putting $c = u + yi \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, -\xi]$, $\{u, y\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $s = a(x) + u$, then

$$\Psi(c) = \frac{1}{\int_I \frac{1}{s+yi} dF} - u - yi = \frac{1}{\int_I \frac{s}{s^2+y^2} dF - yi \int_I \frac{1}{s^2+y^2} dF} - u - yi.$$

If $y \geq 0$, then due to Schwarz's inequality, we observe that

$$\operatorname{Im} \Psi(c) = \frac{y \left(\int_I \frac{1}{s^2+y^2} dF \int_I \frac{s^2}{s^2+y^2} dF - \left(\int_I \frac{1}{\sqrt{s^2+y^2}} \frac{s}{\sqrt{s^2+y^2}} dF \right)^2 \right)}{\left(\int_I \frac{s}{s^2+y^2} dF \right)^2 + y^2 \left(\int_I \frac{1}{s^2+y^2} dF \right)^2} \geq 0.$$

Set $\alpha(v) := \int_{a(x) \leq v+\xi} dF$. Then, $\alpha(v)$ is a right continuous nondecreasing function such that $\alpha(v) \geq 0$, $\alpha(\xi^-) = 0$ and $\alpha(\infty) = 1$. Thus, the Stieltjes transform $\int_I (a(x) + c)^{-1} dF = \int_0^\infty (v + c + \xi)^{-1} d(\alpha(v))$ is analytic with respect to $t = c + \xi \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$ (see [15, Corollary VIII.2b.1]). It is easy to verify that $\Psi(c)$ has no singular point in $\mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, -\xi]$. $\square$

THEOREM 3.3. $\Psi(c) - \xi - 1/H_\xi$ is a complete Bernstein function with respect to $t = c + \xi > 0$.

PROOF. From Theorem 3.1 (3) and Lemma 3.2, we arrive at the conclusion. $\square$

LEMMA 3.4. $\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(c)/c = 0$.

PROOF. From $\Psi(c)/c = 1/(1 - \int_I a(x)/(a(x) + c) dF) - 1$ and

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \int_I \frac{a(x)}{a(x) + c} dF = \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \int_{a(x) > 0} \frac{a(x)}{a(x) + c} dF + \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\xi \leq a(x) < 0} \frac{a(x)}{a(x) + c} dF = 0,$$

we arrive at the conclusion by applying Lebesgue's monotone convergence and dominated convergence theorems. $\square$

LEMMA 3.5. $\Psi(c)$ can be written as

$$(3.1) \quad \Psi(c) = \xi + \frac{1}{H_\xi} + \int_0^\infty \frac{c + \xi}{t(t + c + \xi)} \rho(dt) \quad (c > -\xi)$$

with $\int_0^\infty t^{-1} \rho(dt) = E - \xi - 1/H_\xi$ and $\int_0^\infty 1/(t(t+1)) \rho(dt) < \infty$.

PROOF. From Theorems 3.1 and 3.3, $\Psi(c)$ can be written as

$$\Psi(c) - \xi - 1/H_\xi = \tau(c + \xi) + b + \int_0^\infty \frac{c + \xi}{t(t + c + \xi)} \rho(dt) \quad (c > -\xi),$$

where $\tau \geq 0$, $b \geq 0$, and $\int_0^\infty 1/(t(t+1)) \rho(dt) < \infty$. Since

$$\frac{\Psi(c)}{c} = \tau + \frac{\tau\xi + b + \xi + 1/H_\xi}{c} + \frac{c + \xi}{c} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{t(t + c + \xi)} \rho(dt),$$

we have $\tau = 0$ by applying Lemma 3.4 and Lebesgue's theorem. Since $\partial((c + \xi)/(t(t + c + \xi)))/\partial c = (t + c + \xi)^{-2} > 0$, $(c + \xi)/(t(t + c + \xi))$ is increasing with respect to $c > -\xi$. From $\Psi(-\xi) = \xi + 1/H_\xi$ and Lebesgue's theorem, we obtain $b = 0$. From $\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(c) = E$ and Lebesgue's theorem, we obtain that $E - \xi - 1/H_\xi = \int_0^\infty t^{-1} \rho(dt)$. $\square$

LEMMA 3.6. The condition $E < \infty$ is equivalent to $\int_0^\infty t^{-1} \rho(dt) < \infty$.

PROOF. Lemma 3.5 shows that $\int_0^\infty t^{-1} \rho(dt) = E - \xi - 1/H_\xi$, which implies the conclusion because ξ and $1/H_\xi$ are finite. $\square$

LEMMA 3.7. A function $f(x) \geq 0$ ($x > 0$) is a complete Bernstein function if and only if $1/(x + f(x))$ is a Stieltjes transform. In this case, a right continuous nondecreasing function $0 \leq G(t) \leq 1$ exists such that $1/(x + f(x)) = \int_0^\infty (x + t)^{-1} d(G(t))$.

PROOF. Let $f(x)$ be a complete Bernstein function. Therefore, in accordance with Theorem 3.1 (2), $x + f(x)$ is a complete Bernstein function. Further, in accordance with Theorem 3.1 (5), $x/(x + f(x))$ is a complete Bernstein function. Thus, from Theorem 3.1 (2), we have $x/(x + f(x)) = \tilde{\tau}x + \tilde{b} + \int_0^\infty x/(x + t) \tilde{\sigma}(dt)$ ($x > 0$) with $\tilde{\tau}, \tilde{b} \geq 0$ and a measure $\tilde{\sigma}$ on $(0, \infty)$. We can obtain $\tilde{\tau} = 0$ as follows. From Theorem 3.1 (2), we have $f(x) = \tau x + b + \int_0^\infty x/(x + t) \sigma(dt)$ ($\tau, b \geq 0$). Thus,

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{\tau}x + \tilde{b} + \int_0^\infty \frac{x}{x+t} \tilde{\sigma}(dt)} = 1 + \tau + \frac{b}{x} + \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{x+t} \sigma(dt).$$

If $\tilde{\tau} > 0$, then the process $x \rightarrow \infty$ leads to $0 = 1 + \tau$, which contradicts the fact that $\tau \geq 0$. Therefore, the right continuous nondecreasing function $G(t) := \tilde{b} + \int_0^t \tilde{\sigma}(dt)$ (if $x \geq 0$) or 0 (if $x < 0$) yields the Stieltjes transform

$$\frac{1}{x + f(x)} = \frac{\tilde{b}}{x} + \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{x+t} \tilde{\sigma}(dt) = \int_{0-}^\infty \frac{1}{x+t} d(G(t)).$$

If $\int_{0-}^\infty d(G(t)) > 1$, then $\liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x) = \liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} x(1/\int_{0-}^\infty x/(x+t)^{-1} d(G(t)) - 1) < 0$, which contradicts the assumption that $f(x) \geq 0$. Thus, we find that $0 \leq G(t) \leq 1$.

On the other hand, assume that $1/(x + f(x))$ is a Stieltjes transform such that $1/(x + f(x)) = \hat{\tau} + \frac{\hat{b}}{x} + \int_0^\infty (x + t)^{-1} \hat{\sigma}(dt)$, where $\hat{\tau}$ and $\hat{b}$ are constants, and $\hat{\sigma}$ is a measure on $(0, \infty)$. Since $f(x) \geq 0$, by applying Lebesgue's theorem, we obtain $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} 1/(x + f(x)) = 0 = \hat{\tau}$. Put $G(t) = \hat{b} + \int_0^t \hat{\sigma}(dt)$ (if $x \geq 0$) or 0 (if

$x < 0$). Then, we obtain $f(x) = 1/\int_{0^-}^{\infty} (x+t)^{-1}d(G(t)) - x$. As mentioned above, $\int_{0^-}^{\infty} d(G(t)) > 1$ causes a contradiction. Thus, we have $\int_{0^-}^{\infty} d(G(t)) \leq 1$. Putting $x = u + yi$ and $s = t + u$, as in the proof of Lemma 3.2, we observe that if $y \geq 0$, then

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & \operatorname{Im} f(u + yi) \\ &= \frac{y \left(\left(1 - \int_{0^-}^{\infty} dG \right) \int_{0^-}^{\infty} \frac{1}{s^2 + y^2} dG + \int_{0^-}^{\infty} \frac{1}{s^2 + y^2} dG \int_{0^-}^{\infty} \frac{s^2}{s^2 + y^2} dG \right.}{\left(\int_{0^-}^{\infty} \frac{s}{s^2 + y^2} dG \right)^2 + y^2 \left(\int_{0^-}^{\infty} \frac{1}{s^2 + y^2} dG \right)^2} \\ & \quad \left. - \left(\int_{0^-}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{s^2 + y^2}} \frac{s}{\sqrt{s^2 + y^2}} dG \right)^2 \right) \\ & \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the analytic function $f(u + yi)$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$ (see [15, Corollary VIII.2b.1]) preserves the upper and lower half-planes. This implies, in accordance with Theorem 3.1 (3), that $f(x)$ is a complete Bernstein function. $\square$

We characterize the relation between the subset of complete Bernstein functions such that $\tau = 0$ and all the probability measures on $[0, \infty)$.

THEOREM 3.8. *A complete Bernstein function $f(x) = \tau x + b + \int_0^{\infty} x/(x+t)\sigma(dt)$ can be written as $f(x) = 1/(\int_{0^-}^{\infty} (x+t)^{-1}d(G(t))) - x$ with a distribution function $0 \leq G(t) \leq 1$ with $G(\infty) = 1$ and $G(0^-) = 0$ if and only if $\tau = 0$.*

PROOF. From Lemma 3.7, for a complete Bernstein function $\tau x + b + \int_0^{\infty} x/(x+t)\sigma(dt)$, a right continuous nondecreasing function $0 \leq G(t) \leq 1$ exists such that $1/(x + \tau x + b + \int_0^{\infty} x/(x+t)\sigma(dt)) = \int_{0^-}^{\infty} (x+t)^{-1}d(G(t))$. Therefore, we observe that $\int_{0^-}^{\infty} x/(x+t)d(G(t)) = 1/(1 + \tau + b/x + \int_0^{\infty} (x+t)^{-1}\sigma(dt))$, which implies $\int_{0^-}^{\infty} d(G(t)) = 1/(1 + \tau)$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, if $\tau = 0$, then $\int_{0^-}^{\infty} d(G(t)) = 1$. In this case, we have $f(x) = 1/(\int_{0^-}^{\infty} (x+t)^{-1}d(G(t))) - x$. The converse is obtained by applying Lebesgue's theorem to the equation $1/\int_{0^-}^{\infty} x/(x+t)d(G(t)) - 1 = \tau + b/x + \int_0^{\infty} (x+t)^{-1}\sigma(dt)$. $\square$

LEMMA 3.9. $\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \Psi^{(n)}(c) = 0$ ($n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$).

PROOF. Using (3.1), we have (see [15, Corollary VIII.2b.2])

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \Psi'(c) &= \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{(t+c+\xi)^2} \rho(dt), \Psi''(c) = - \int_0^{\infty} \frac{2}{(t+c+\xi)^3} \rho(dt), \dots \\ \Psi^{(n)}(c) &= (-1)^{n-1} n! \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{(t+c+\xi)^{n+1}} \rho(dt). \end{aligned}$$

By applying Lebesgue's (monotone convergence) theorem, we conclude that $\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \Psi^{(n)}(c) = 0$ ($n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$). $\square$

LEMMA 3.10. *If $E < \infty$, then $\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} c^n \Psi^{(n)}(c) = 0$ ($n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$).*

PROOF. From Lemma 3.6, $\int_0^{\infty} t^{-1} \rho(dt) < \infty$. From properties such as

$$\begin{aligned} c^n \Psi^{(n)}(c) &= (-1)^{n-1} n! \frac{c^n}{(c+\xi)^n} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{t(c+\xi)^n}{(t+c+\xi)^{n+1}} \frac{\rho(dt)}{t}, \\ \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c^n}{(c+\xi)^n} &= 1, \quad \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \frac{t(c+\xi)^n}{(t+c+\xi)^{n+1}} = 0, \\ \left| \frac{t(c+\xi)^n}{(t+c+\xi)^{n+1}} \right| &< 1 \quad (t, c+\xi > 0), \end{aligned}$$

we can apply Lebesgue's (dominated convergence) theorem and obtain $\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} c^n \Psi^{(n)}(c) = 0$ ($n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$). $\square$

LEMMA 3.11. $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max} = \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} c \Psi'(c)$ if one of them exists. In particular, if $E < \infty$, $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max} = 0$.

PROOF. From (2.2), we obtain

$$(3.4) \quad \underline{u}_{\max} = \frac{(1 + \frac{\Psi(c_m + \underline{u}_{\max})}{c_m + \underline{u}_{\max}})}{1 + \Psi'(c_m + \underline{u}_{\max})} c_m + \underline{u}_{\max} \Psi'(c_m + \underline{u}_{\max}).$$

From $\liminf_{m \rightarrow E^-} c_m + \underline{u}_{\max} = \liminf_{m \rightarrow E^-} \Psi^{-1}(m + \underline{u}_{\max}) \geq \liminf_{m \rightarrow E^-} \Psi^{-1}(m) = \infty$, we obtain $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} c_m + \underline{u}_{\max} = \infty$. Therefore, using Lemmas 3.4 and 3.9, we have $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max} = \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} c \Psi'(c)$, provided one of them exists. The rest of this lemma is deduced from Lemma 3.10. $\square$

LEMMA 3.12 [10, Lemma 1.1.2]. If $\lim_{c \rightarrow (-\xi)^+} \Psi'(c) = \infty$, $\lim_{c \rightarrow (-\xi)^+} (-1)^{n-1} \Psi^{(n)}(c) = \infty$ ($n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$).

PROOF. From (3.3), we have $(-1)^{n-1} \Psi^{(n)}(c) = n! \int_0^\infty (t + c + \xi)^{-n-1} \rho(dt) \geq 0$ ($c > -\xi$, $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$). Since $\Psi^{(3)}(c) \geq 0$, we observe that $\Psi'(a) - \Psi'(c) = \int_c^a \Psi^{(2)}(x) dx \geq \Psi^{(2)}(c)(a - c)$ for each $-\xi < c < a$. This implies that $\Psi^{(2)}(c) \leq (\Psi'(a) - \Psi'(c))/(a - c)$. Thus, using $\lim_{c \rightarrow (-\xi)^+} \Psi'(c) = \infty$, we have $\lim_{c \rightarrow (-\xi)^+} \Psi^{(2)}(c) = -\infty$. For each $n \in \{3, 4, 5, \dots\}$, we find that $(-1)^n (\Psi^{(n-1)}(a) - \Psi^{(n-1)}(c)) = \int_c^a (-1)^n \Psi^{(n)}(x) dx \geq (-1)^n \Psi^{(n)}(c)(a - c)$, which implies that $(-1)^{n-1} \Psi^{(n)}(c) \geq (-1)^{n-2} \Psi^{(n-1)}(c)/(a - c) + (-1)^{n-1} \Psi^{(n-1)}(a)/(a - c)$. Therefore, by induction on n , we arrive at the conclusion. $\square$

LEMMA 3.13. $\lim_{c \rightarrow (-\xi)^+} (c + \xi)^{n+1} \Psi^{(n)}(c) = 0$ ($n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$).

PROOF. From (3.3), we have $(c + \xi)^{n+1} \Psi^{(n)}(c) = (-1)^{n-1} n! \int_0^\infty (c + \xi)^{n+1} / (t + c + \xi)^{n+1} \rho(dt)$. Thus, applying Lebesgue's (monotone convergence) theorem, we arrive at the conclusion. $\square$

THEOREM 3.14. If $H_\xi = \infty$, then $\lim_{m \rightarrow (\xi+1/H_\xi)^+} \underline{u}_{\max} = 0$. If $H_\xi < \infty$, then $\lim_{m \rightarrow (\xi+1/H_\xi)^+} \underline{u}_{\max} > 0$, which can assume any positive value, exists.

PROOF. From (3.3), we have $\Psi'(c) > 0$ and $\Psi''(c) < 0$ for $c > -\xi$. As shown in the proof of Lemma 2.5, $c'_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}} = 1/\Psi'(m + \underline{u}_{\max}) > 0$. Therefore, $\lambda := \lim_{m \rightarrow (\xi+1/H_\xi)^+} c_m + \underline{u}_{\max}$ exists such that $-\xi \leq \lambda < \infty$. Since $\underline{u}_{\max} = \Psi(c_m + \underline{u}_{\max}) - m$, $\lim_{m \rightarrow (\xi+1/H_\xi)^+} \underline{u}_{\max} = \Psi(\lambda) - \xi - 1/H_\xi$. From $\Psi''(c) < 0$, $\Psi'(\lambda^+) > 0$ exists (including $+\infty$). From the proof of Lemma 3.11, we observe that $\underline{u}_{\max} = (c_m + \underline{u}_{\max} + \Psi(c_m + \underline{u}_{\max})) / (1 + 1/\Psi'(c_m + \underline{u}_{\max}))$, which induces $\Psi(\lambda) - \xi - 1/H_\xi = (\lambda + \Psi(\lambda)) / (1 + 1/\Psi'(\lambda^+))$.

If $H_\xi = \infty$, then $\Psi(-\xi) = \xi$. For each $c > -\xi$, put $m := (\Psi(c) - c\Psi'(c)) / (1 + \Psi'(c))$ and $v := \Psi(c) - m$. Then

$$\begin{cases} m + v = \Psi(c), \\ v = (m + c)\Psi'(c). \end{cases}$$

Moreover, from $\partial m / \partial c = -(c + \Psi(c))\Psi''(c) / (1 + \Psi'(c))^2 > 0$, we obtain $\xi < m < E$. Thus, in accordance with (2.2), we can consider $v = \underline{u}_{\max}$ and $c = c_m + \underline{u}_{\max}$. Therefore, $-\xi \leq \lambda \leq c_m + \underline{u}_{\max} = c$ for each $c > -\xi$, which implies that $\lambda = -\xi$. Thus, $\lim_{m \rightarrow (\xi+1/H_\xi)^+} \underline{u}_{\max} = \Psi(-\xi) - \xi = 0$.

If $H_\xi < \infty$, then from $(\lambda + \Psi(\lambda)) / (1 + 1/\Psi'(\lambda^+)) \geq 1/(H_\xi(1 + 1/\Psi'(\lambda^+))) > 0$, $\lim_{m \rightarrow (\xi+1/H_\xi)^+} \underline{u}_{\max} > 0$. In Example 2.7, we observe that $\xi + 1/H_\xi = r/3$

and $\underline{u}_{\max} = (3r - m)(m + r)/(m + 9r)$. Thus, we obtain $\lim_{m \rightarrow (r/3)^+} \underline{u}_{\max} = 8r/21$ ($r > 0$), which implies the conclusion. $\square$

The following Lemma is similar to [11, Lemma 2.10].

LEMMA 3.15. $|\Psi^{(n+1)}(c)/\Psi^{(n)}(c)| < (n+1)/(c+\xi)$ and $\Psi'(c)/(\Psi(c) - \xi - 1/H_\xi) < 1/(c+\xi)$ ($c > -\xi$, $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$).

PROOF. From (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi^{(n+1)}(c)| &= (n+1)! \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{(t+c+\xi)^{n+2}} \rho(dt) \\ &= n! \int_0^\infty \frac{n+1}{t+c+\xi} \times \frac{1}{(t+c+\xi)^{n+1}} \rho(dt) \\ &< \frac{n+1}{c+\xi} \times n! \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{(t+c+\xi)^{n+1}} \rho(dt) \\ &= \frac{n+1}{c+\xi} |\Psi^{(n)}(c)| \quad (n = 1, 2, 3, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, from (3.1), we observe that

$$(c+\xi)\Psi'(c) = \int_0^\infty \frac{c+\xi}{t(t+c+\xi)} \rho(dt) - \int_0^\infty \frac{(c+\xi)^2}{t(t+c+\xi)^2} \rho(dt) < \Psi(c) - \xi - 1/H_\xi.$$

$\square$

COROLLARY 3.16. $\liminf_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}'_{\max} \geq -1/2$.

PROOF. From Lemma 2.5, we have $\underline{u}_{\max} = (m + c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}})\Psi'(c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}})$, $\Psi'(c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}})c'_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}} = 1$ and $m = (\Psi(c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}}) - c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}}\Psi'(c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}}))/(1 + \Psi'(c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}}))$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{u}'_{\max} &= -1 - \frac{1 + \Psi'(c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}})}{(m + c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}})c'_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}}\Psi''(c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}})} \\ &= -1 - \frac{\Psi'(c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}})}{(c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}} + \xi)\Psi''(c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}})} \times \frac{(c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}} + \xi)(1 + \Psi'(c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}}))^2}{c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}}(1 + \frac{\Psi(c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}})}{c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}}})}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, from Lemmas 2.1, 3.4, and 3.9, we have

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \frac{c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}} + \xi}{c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}}} \cdot \frac{(1 + \Psi'(c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}}))^2}{1 + \frac{\Psi(c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}})}{c_{m+\underline{u}_{\max}}}} = 1.$$

From Lemma 3.15, we observe that $-\Psi''(c)/\Psi'(c) < 2/(c+\xi)$, which implies that $-1 - \Psi'(c)/((c+\xi)\Psi''(c)) > -1/2$. Therefore, we conclude that

$$\liminf_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}'_{\max} = \liminf_{c \rightarrow \infty} \left(-1 - \frac{\Psi'(c)}{(c+\xi)\Psi''(c)} \right) \geq -\frac{1}{2}.$$

$\square$

LEMMA 3.17. Assume $E < \infty$. Then,

$$(3.5) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \frac{\underline{u}_{\max}}{\underline{E}} = \frac{1}{\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\frac{c\Psi'(c)}{E-\Psi(c)} + 1}} = \frac{1}{\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\frac{\int_0^\infty (c/(c+t))^2 \rho(dt)}{\int_0^\infty c/(c+t) \rho(dt)} + 1}}$$

if one of three limits exists.

PROOF. From (2.2) and (3.4), we have

$$\frac{\underline{u}_{\max}}{\underline{E}} = \frac{1}{\frac{E - \Psi(c_m + \underline{u}_{\max})}{c_m + \underline{u}_{\max} \Psi'(c_m + \underline{u}_{\max}) (1 + \Psi(c_m + \underline{u}_{\max}) / c_m + \underline{u}_{\max})} + \frac{c_m + \underline{u}_{\max} + E}{c_m + \underline{u}_{\max} + \Psi(c_m + \underline{u}_{\max})}}.$$

Thus, from Lemmas 1.1, 2.1, 3.4, and 3.10, we obtain $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max} / \underline{E} = 1 / (1 / \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} (c \Psi'(c) / (E - \Psi(c))) + 1)$. Using (3.1) and (3.3) we observe that

$$(3.6) \quad \frac{c \Psi'(c)}{E - \Psi(c)} = \frac{\int_0^\infty ((c + \xi) / (t + c + \xi))^2 \rho(dt)}{(1 + \frac{\xi}{c}) \int_0^\infty (c + \xi) / (t + c + \xi) \rho(dt)},$$

which yields the desired equation. $\square$

LEMMA 3.18.

$$(3.7) \quad - \lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}'_{\max} = 1 + \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Psi'(c)}{(c + \xi) \Psi''(c)} = 1 - \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_0^\infty (c / (c + t))^2 \rho(dt)}{2 \int_0^\infty (c / (c + t))^3 \rho(dt)},$$

if one of three limits exists. In this case, if $E < \infty$, its value is equal to $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max} / \underline{E}$.

PROOF. From (3.3), we have $\Psi'(c) / ((c + \xi) \Psi''(c)) = - \int_0^\infty ((c + \xi) / (t + c + \xi))^2 \rho(dt) / (2 \int_0^\infty ((c + \xi) / (t + c + \xi))^3 \rho(dt))$. From the proof of Corollary 3.16, we have $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}'_{\max} = -1 - \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \Psi'(c) / ((c + \xi) \Psi''(c))$ if one of them exists. In this case, if $E < \infty$, then from $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max} = 0$ (Lemma 3.11) and by using the mean value theorem, we obtain $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max} / \underline{E} = - \lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \int_m^E \underline{u}'_{\max}(t) dt / \underline{E} = - \lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}'_{\max}$, which implies the conclusion. $\square$

THEOREM 3.19. If $\int_0^\infty \rho(dt) < \infty$, $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max} / \underline{E} = 1/2$.

PROOF. Using $\int_0^\infty \rho(dt) < \infty$ and $\int_0^\infty 1 / (t(t + 1)) \rho(dt) < \infty$, we have $E < \infty$ (Lemma 3.6). By applying Lebesgue's theorem, we observe that $\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} (\int_0^\infty c / (c + t) \rho(dt) / \int_0^\infty (c / (c + t))^2 \rho(dt)) = 1$. Thus, from Lemma 3.17, we obtain $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max} / \underline{E} = 1/2$. $\square$

COROLLARY 3.20. $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max} / \underline{E} = 1/2$ for any finite game $\{(a_j, p_j)\}$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^n a_j p_j > 0$, $\sum_{j=1}^n p_j = 1$, $0 \leq p_j < 1$, and $1 \leq j \leq n$.

PROOF. The complete Bernstein function

$$\Psi(c) - \xi - \frac{1}{H_\xi} = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{p_j}{a_j + c}} - c - \xi - 1/H_\xi \quad (c > -\xi)$$

is a rational function with respect to c , which is analytic on $\mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, -\xi]$ and preserves the upper and lower half-planes (Theorems 3.1 and 3.3). Therefore, using [8, Theorem 2.2 (vi)], we obtain the representation $\Psi(c) - \xi - 1/H_\xi = - \sum_{j=1}^m e_j / (c + d_j) + k$, where $e_j > 0$, $d_j > \xi$ and k is a constant. Since $\Psi(-\xi) = \xi + 1/H_\xi$, $k = \sum_{j=1}^m e_j / (d_j - \xi)$ holds. Defining $\sigma(dt)$ as the sum of Dirac measures $\sum_{j=1}^m e_j / (d_j - \xi) \delta_{d_j - \xi}$, we observe that

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{c + \xi}{t + c + \xi} \sigma(dt) = - \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{e_j}{c + d_j} + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{e_j}{d_j - \xi} = \Psi(c) - \xi - \frac{1}{H_\xi}.$$

Using Theorem 3.1, we obtain $\int_0^\infty \rho(dt) = \int_0^\infty t \sigma(dt) = \sum_{j=1}^m e_j < \infty$, which, in accordance with Theorem 3.19, implies the conclusion. $\square$

4. Abelian theorems

In the following paragraphs, we assume that a nonzero measure $\rho(dt)$ originates from (3.1). For a function $f(x) > 0$, $\omega_f := \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \log f(x)/\log x$ is termed *the upper order* (see [1, Section 2.2.2]). We will show that $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max}/\underline{E}$ can be calculated by the upper order of the function $\int_0^x \rho(dt)$.

A measurable function $f(x) > 0$ is said to be *regularly varying* of index r , written as $f \in R_r$, if $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(\lambda x)/f(x) = \lambda^r$ for each $\lambda > 0$ (see [1, Section 1.4.2]). It is easy to verify that $\omega_f = r$ if $f \in R_r$. The notation $l(x)$ is used only for a *slowly varying* function such that $l(x) \in R_0$. We write $f(x) \sim cg(x)$ when $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x)/g(x) = c$. If $c = 0$, the relation $f(x) \sim cg(x)$ suggests that $f(x) = o(g(x))$ (see [1, Preface]).

LEMMA 4.1. *If $\int_0^x \rho(dt) \in R_r$, $0 \leq r \leq 2$. In this case, if $E < \infty$, $0 \leq r \leq 1$.*

PROOF. We can write $\int_0^x \rho(dt) = x^r l(x)$ with $l(x) \in R_0$. Assuming $r < 0$, then $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^x \rho(dt) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^r l(x) = 0$ (see [1, Proposition 1.3.6]), which contradicts the fact that $\int_0^\infty \rho(dt) > 0$. Assuming $r > 2$, we have $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^x \rho(dt)/(x(x+1)) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^{r-2} l(x) \cdot \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} 1/(1+1/x) = \infty$. On the other hand, for each $x > 0$, we have $\int_0^x \rho(dt)/(x(x+1)) \leq \int_0^\infty (t(t+1))^{-1} \rho(dt) < \infty$ (Lemma 3.5), which is a contradiction.

If $E < \infty$, then $\int_0^\infty t^{-1} \rho(dt) < \infty$ (Lemma 3.6). Thus, for each $x > 0$, we have $\int_0^x \rho(dt)/x \leq \int_0^\infty t^{-1} \rho(dt) < \infty$, which implies that $r \leq 1$. $\square$

LEMMA 4.2. *Suppose $0 \leq r < n$. Then, $\int_0^x \rho(dt) \sim x^r l(x)$ ($x \rightarrow \infty$) if and only if $\int_0^\infty (x/(x+t))^n \rho(dt) \sim \Gamma(n-r)\Gamma(r+1)x^r l(x)/\Gamma(n)$ ($x \rightarrow \infty$).*

PROOF. The nondecreasing function $U(x) := \int_0^x \rho(dt)$ satisfies $U(0^-) = 0$. Since $0 < n-r \leq n$, using [1, Theorem 1.7.4], we obtain that $U(x) \sim x^r l(x)$ ($x \rightarrow \infty$) is equivalent to

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{d(U(t))}{(x+t)^n} \sim \frac{\Gamma(n-r)\Gamma(r+1)}{\Gamma(n)} x^{r-n} l(x) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty),$$

which implies the conclusion. $\square$

LEMMA 4.3. *If $\int_0^x \rho(dt) \in R_r$ and $r \neq 2$, then $\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \Psi'(c)/(c\Psi''(c)) = 1/(r-2)$.*

PROOF. From Lemma 4.1, we have $0 \leq r < 2$. From Lemma 4.2, we observe that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_0^\infty (x/(x+t))^2 \rho(dt)}{\int_0^\infty (x/(x+t))^3 \rho(dt)} = \frac{\Gamma(3)\Gamma(2-r)}{\Gamma(2)\Gamma(3-r)} = \frac{2}{2-r}.$$

Therefore, the relation (3.7) implies the conclusion. $\square$

THEOREM 4.4. *If $E < \infty$ and $\int_0^x \rho(dt) \in R_r$, then $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max}/\underline{E} = (1-r)/(2-r)$ with $0 \leq r \leq 1$.*

PROOF. From Lemmas 3.18 and 4.3, we obtain $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max}/\underline{E} = 1 + \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \Psi'(c)/((c+\xi)\Psi''(c)) = (1-r)/(2-r)$. $\square$

Whenever we use the notation $q(t)$, it is understood that $\rho(dt) = q(t)dt$ with $q(t) \geq 0$.

LEMMA 4.5. *If $q(t) \in R_\alpha$, then $\alpha \leq 1$. In addition, if $E < \infty$, then $\alpha \leq 0$.*

PROOF. We can write $q(t) = t^\alpha l(t)$ with $l(t) \in R_0$. From [1, Corollary 1.4.2], $X > 0$ exists such that $l(x)$ is locally bounded in $[X, \infty)$. Assuming $\alpha > 1$, then using [1, Propositions 1.3.6 and 1.5.8], we obtain $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \int_X^x \rho(dt)/(x(x+1)) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^{\alpha-1} l(x)/(\alpha+1) \cdot \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} 1/(1+1/x) = \infty$. On the other hand, for

each $x > X$, we observe that $\int_X^x \rho(dt)/(x(x+1)) \leq \int_X^x (t(t+1))^{-1} \rho(dt) \leq \int_0^\infty (t(t+1))^{-1} \rho(dt) < \infty$ (Lemma 3.5), which is a contradiction.

When $E < \infty$, we have $\int_X^x \rho(dt)/x \leq \int_0^\infty t^{-1} \rho(dt) < \infty$ (Lemma 3.6). Thus, arguments similar to the one above yield the conclusion. $\square$

LEMMA 4.6. *If $q(t) \in R_\alpha$, then $\int_0^x q(t)dt \in R_{\alpha+1}$ ($\alpha > -1$) or $\int_0^x q(t)dt \in R_0$ ($\alpha \leq -1$).*

PROOF. As the proof of Lemma 4.5, if $\alpha > -1$, using [1, Proposition 1.5.8], we obtain $\int_X^x t^\alpha l(t)dt \sim x^{\alpha+1}l(x)/(\alpha+1) \in R_{\alpha+1}$. If $\alpha = -1$, then from [1, Proposition 1.5.9a], we have $\int_X^x t^{-1}l(t)dt \in R_0$. If $\alpha < -1$, then the nondecreasing function $\int_0^x q(t)dt = \int_0^x t^\alpha l(t)dt$ is bounded as will be shown below, which suggests that $\int_0^x q(t)dt \in R_0$. Put $\varepsilon := -(\alpha+1)/2 > 0$. Then, from $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{-\varepsilon}l(t) = 0$, $Y > 0$ exists such that $0 \leq t^{-\varepsilon}l(t) \leq 1$ for each $t \geq Y$. Therefore, for each $x \geq Y$, we find that $\int_0^x q(t)dt \leq \int_0^Y q(t)dt + \int_Y^x t^{-\varepsilon}l(t)t^{-1-\varepsilon}dt \leq \int_0^Y q(t)dt + 1/(\varepsilon Y^\varepsilon) < \infty$. $\square$

COROLLARY 4.7. *If $E < \infty$ and $q(t) \in R_\alpha$, then $\alpha \leq 0$ and*

$$(4.1) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \frac{u_{\max}}{E} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } \alpha \leq -1, \\ \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}, & \text{if } -1 < \alpha \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

PROOF. It is the direct consequence of Theorem 4.4 and Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6. $\square$

5. Tauberian theorems

Given a measurable function $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let $\check{f}(z) := \int_0^\infty t^{-z-1} f(t) dt$ be its Mellin transform for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that the integral converges absolutely (see [1, 2, 3]). For example, putting $k(x) := 2x^2$ ($0 < x < 1$) or 0 ($x \geq 1$), we obtain $\check{k}(z) = 2/(2-z)$ ($-\infty < \operatorname{Re} z < 2$). In addition, putting $h(x) := x$ ($0 < x < 1$) or 0 ($x \geq 1$), we obtain $\check{h}(z) = 1/(1-z)$ ($-\infty < \operatorname{Re} z < 1$). Given measurable functions $f, g : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let $(f * g)(x) := \int_0^\infty t^{-1} f(x/t) g(t) dt$ be the Mellin convolution of these functions for $x > 0$ such that the integral converges absolutely.

THEOREM 5.1. *If $E < \infty$ and $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}'_{\max}$ exists, then $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max}/\underline{E} = (1-r)/(2-r)$ ($0 \leq r \leq 1$) and $\int_0^x \rho(dt) \in R_r$, where r is the upper order of $\int_0^\infty (x/(x+t))^n \rho(dt)$ ($n > 1$).*

PROOF. Putting $K(x) := \int_0^\infty (x/(x+t))^3 \rho(dt)$, we observe that $\check{k}(2^-) = \infty$ and

$$\frac{(k * K)(x)}{K(x)} = \frac{\int_0^\infty (x/(x+t))^2 \rho(dt)}{\int_0^\infty (x/(x+t))^3 \rho(dt)} \geq 1.$$

From Lemma 3.18, $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} (k * K)(x)/K(x) = c \geq 1$ exists. As $K(x)$ is an increasing function, from [1, Theorem 5.2.3 and Section 2.1.2], we obtain $c = \check{k}(\omega_K) = 2/(2-\omega_K)$, $\omega_K < 2$ and $K(x)$ is regularly varying. Thus, $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max}/\underline{E} = -\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}'_{\max} = 1 - 1/(2 - \omega_K) = (1 - \omega_K)/(2 - \omega_K)$. From Lemma 4.2, it follows that $\int_0^x \rho(dt) \in R_{\omega_K}$. Moreover, from Lemma 4.1, we have $0 \leq \omega_K \leq 1$. This implies that the upper order of $\int_0^\infty (x/(x+t))^n \rho(dt)$ is always ω_K for each $n > 1$. $\square$

THEOREM 5.2. *If $E < \infty$ and $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max}/\underline{E} \neq 0$ exists, then $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max}/\underline{E} = -\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}'_{\max} = (1-r)/(2-r)$ ($0 \leq r < 1$) and $\int_0^x \rho(dt) \in R_r$, where r is the upper order of $\int_0^\infty (x/(x+t))^n \rho(dt)$ ($n > 1$).*

PROOF. This proof is formally the same as that in Theorem 5.1. Putting $S(x) := \int_0^\infty (x/(x+t))^2 \rho(dt)$, we observe that $\check{h}(1^-) = \infty$ and

$$\frac{(h * S)(x)}{S(x)} = \frac{\int_0^\infty x/(x+t) \rho(dt)}{\int_0^\infty (x/(x+t))^2 \rho(dt)} \geq 1.$$

From Lemma 3.17, $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} (h * S)(x)/S(x) = c \geq 1$ exists. As $S(x)$ is an increasing function, from [1, Theorem 5.2.3 and Section 2.1.2], we obtain $c = \check{h}(\omega_S) = 1/(1 - \omega_S)$, $\omega_S < 1$, and that $S(x)$ is regularly varying. Thus, $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max}/\underline{E} = 1/(c+1) = (1 - \omega_S)/(2 - \omega_S)$. From Lemma 4.2, it follows that $\int_0^x \rho(dt) \in R_{\omega_S}$. Moreover, from Lemma 4.1, we have $0 \leq \omega_S < 1$. This implies that the upper order of $\int_0^\infty (x/(x+t))^n \rho(dt)$ is always ω_K for each $n > 1$. In this case, based on Lemmas 3.18 and 4.3, $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}'_{\max}$ exists. $\square$

COROLLARY 5.3. *If $E < \infty$, the following are equivalent.*

- (a) $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max}/\underline{E} \neq 0$ exists.
- (b) $\int_0^x \rho(dt) \in R_r$ ($r \neq 1$).
- (c) $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}'_{\max} \neq 0$ exists.

PROOF. Using Theorems 4.4, 5.1, and 5.2, and Lemmas 3.18 and 4.3, we arrive at the conclusion. $\square$

It is noteworthy that $\int_0^x \rho(dt) \in R_1$ includes $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max}/\underline{E} = 0$. However, the converse is not necessarily true because a nonregularly varying function $\int_e^x \rho(dt)$

$= (2 + \sin(\log x))x/(1 + \log x)^{3/2} - (2 + \sin 1)e/(2\sqrt{2})$ ($x \geq e$) provides an example with $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max}/\underline{E} = 0$. The details are left to the reader. In this direction, we observe that $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max}/\underline{E} = 0$ if and only if $\int_0^\infty (x+t)^{-1}\rho(dt)$ is normalized slowly varying. Because, since $\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} c\Psi'(c)/(E - \Psi(c)) = 0$ (Lemma 3.17), $E - \Psi(c) = \int_0^\infty (t+c+\xi)^{-1}\rho(dt)$ (Lemma 3.5) is normalized slowly varying (see [1, (1.3.4)]).

LEMMA 5.4 [1, Theorem 1.7.2]. *If $\int_0^x f(t)dt \sim cx^r l(x)$ ($x \rightarrow \infty$), where $f(x)$ is nondecreasing or nonincreasing in an interval (T, ∞) ($T > 0$), then $f(x) \sim cx^{r-1}l(x)$ ($x \rightarrow \infty$).*

COROLLARY 5.5. *Assuming $E < \infty$, $\rho(dt) = q(t)dt$ and $q(t)$ is nonincreasing in an interval (T, ∞) ($T > 0$). When $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max}/\underline{E} \neq 0$ exists, the following properties hold:*

- (1) *If $\omega_q \leq -1$, then $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max}/\underline{E} = 1/2$ and $\int_0^x q(t)dt$ is slowly varying.*
- (2) *If $\omega_q > -1$, then $\omega_q < 0$, $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max}/\underline{E} = -\omega_q/(1 - \omega_q)$, and $q(t)$ is regularly varying.*

PROOF. Put $S(x) := \int_0^\infty (x/(x+t))^2 q(t)dt$. Then, by applying Theorem 5.2, we obtain $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max}/\underline{E} = (1 - \omega_S)/(2 - \omega_S)$, ($0 \leq \omega_S < 1$) and $\int_0^x q(t)dt \in R_{\omega_S}$. Thus, by Lemma 5.4 we find that $\int_0^x q(t)dt \sim x^{\omega_S} l(x)$ ($x \rightarrow \infty$) and $q(t) \sim \omega_S t^{\omega_S-1} l(t)$ ($t \rightarrow \infty$).

(1) Assume $\omega_q < -1$. From $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \log q(t)/\log t < -1$, we obtain $\int_0^\infty q(t)dt < \infty$, $\int_0^x q(t)dt \in R_0$, and $\omega_S = 0$. Next, assume $\omega_q = -1$. If $\omega_S \neq 0$, we have $\omega_q = \omega_S - 1 = -1$, which is a contradiction.

(2) Assume $\omega_q > -1$ and $\omega_S \neq 0$. Then, we find that $\omega_q = \omega_S - 1 < 0$ and $\lim_{m \rightarrow E^-} \underline{u}_{\max}/\underline{E} = -\omega_q/(1 - \omega_q)$. Next, assume $\omega_q > -1$ and $\omega_S = 0$. Then, $q(t) = o(t^{-1}l(t))$ ($t \rightarrow \infty$) and $\omega_q \leq -1$, thus contradicting the assumption. $\square$

References

- [1] N. H. Bingham, C. M. Goldie and J. L. Teugels, *Regular variation* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987).
- [2] N. H. Bingham and A. Inoue, ‘Ratio Mercerian theorems with applications to Hankel and Fourier transforms’, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **79** (1999), 626–648.
- [3] N. H. Bingham and A. Inoue, ‘Tauberian and Mercerian theorems for systems of kernels’, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **252** (2000), 177–197.
- [4] P. Clément and J. Prüss, ‘Completely positive measures and Feller semigroups’, *Math. Ann.* **287** (1990), 73–105.
- [5] W. Farkas, N. Jacob and R. L. Schilling, ‘Function spaces related to continuous negative definite functions: ψ -Bessel potential spaces’, *Dissertationes Math.* **393** (2001), 62 pp.
- [6] W. Feller, *An introduction to probability theory and its application*, vol. I, II (John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1957, 1966).
- [7] F. Gesztesy and B. Simon, ‘Uniqueness theorems in inverse spectral theory for one-dimensional Schrödinger operators’, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **348** (1996), 349–373.
- [8] F. Gesztesy and E. Tsekanovskii, ‘On matrix-valued Herglotz functions’, *Math. Nachr.* **218** (2000), 61–138.
- [9] Y. Hirashita, ‘Game pricing and double sequence of random variables’, Preprint, arXiv:math.OA/0703076 (2007).
- [10] K. W. Homan, *An analytic semigroup approach to convolution Volterra equations*

- (Delft University Press, Netherlands, 2003).
- [11] N. Jacob and R. L. Schilling, ‘Subordination in the sense of S. Bochner—an approach through pseudo-differential operators’, *Math. Nachr.* **178** (1996), 199–231.
 - [12] J. L. Kelly, ‘A new interpretation of information rate’, *Bell System Tech. J.* **35** (1956), 917–926.
 - [13] D. G. Luenberger, *Investment science* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1998).
 - [14] R. L. Schilling, ‘Subordination in the sense of Bochner and a related functional calculus’, *J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A* **64** (1998), 368–396.
 - [15] D. V. Widder, *The Laplace Transform* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1941).

Chukyo University
 Nagoya, 466-8666
 Japan
 e-mail: yukioh@cnc.chukyo-u.ac.jp